

HAZARD PROCESSES AND MARTINGALE HAZARD PROCESSES

DELIA COCULESCU AND ASHKAN NIKEGHBALI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we provide a solution to two problems which have been open in default time modeling in credit risk. We first show that if τ is an arbitrary random (default) time such that its Azéma's supermartingale $Z_t^\tau = \mathbf{P}(\tau > t | \mathcal{F}_t)$ is continuous, then τ avoids stopping times. We then disprove a conjecture about the equality between the hazard process and the martingale hazard process, which first appeared in [14], and we show how it should be modified to become a theorem. The pseudo-stopping times, introduced in [21], appear as the most general class of random times for which these two processes are equal. We also show that these two processes always differ when τ is an honest time.

1. INTRODUCTION

Random times which are not stopping times have recently played an increasing role in the modeling of default times in the hazard-rate approach of the credit risk. Following [14], [9], [3], a hazard rate model may be constructed in two steps. We begin with a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$ satisfying the usual assumptions. The default time τ is defined as a random time (i.e., a nonnegative $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable) which is not an $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time). Then, a second filtration $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)$ plays an important role for pricing. This is obtained by progressively enlarging the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ with the random time τ : $\mathbb{G}$ is the smallest filtration satisfying the usual assumptions, containing the original filtration $\mathbb{F}$, and for which τ is a stopping time, such as explained in [15], [17]. The filtration $\mathbb{G}$ is usually considered as the relevant filtration to consider in credit risk models: it represents the information available on the market. The enlargement of filtration provides a simple formula to compute the $\mathbb{G}$ -predictable compensator of the process $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$, which is a fundamental process in the modeling of default times. Note that an alternative and more direct hazard-rate approach, which historically appeared first, consists in introducing one single global filtration $\mathbb{G}$ from the start, where the default time is a totally inaccessible stopping time with a given intensity. Major papers using the intensity based framework are [13], [12], [19], [20], [8].

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G07, 60G44, 60G99.

Key words and phrases. Default modeling, credit risk models, random times, enlargements of filtrations, hazard process, immersed filtrations, pseudo-stopping times, honest times.

Both hazard-rate approaches mentioned above, i.e., the direct approach or the one based on two different sets of filtrations, model the occurring of the default as a surprise for the market, that is, the default time is a totally inaccessible stopping time in the global market filtration $\mathbb{G}$. The technique of enlargements of filtrations appears to be a useful tool, since it allows to compute easily the price of a derivative, using the hazard process. It allows as well an explicit construction of the default compensator (in section 3, we shall give simple "universal" formulae for the compensator of pseudo-stopping times and honest times). For instance, one can take into account the link between the default-free and the defaultable assets, or the incomplete information about the firm fundamentals, and thus construct the compensator in an endogenous manner ([7], [18], [9], [11], [4], [10]).

We now briefly justify the use of non stopping times for default times (see [5] for a more detailed analysis, where no-arbitrage conditions are also studied).

Defaultable claims are defined by their maturity date, say T , and their promised stream of cash flows through time. Typically these consist of a promised face value, to be paid at maturity and a stream to be paid during the lifetime of the contract. We may suppose that the promised claim is an $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable, denoted by P , since the intermediary payments may be invested in the default-free money market account. In addition, there is a random time τ at which the default occurs, and when a recovery payment $R \neq P$ is made, in replacement of the promised one. The defaultable payoff is of the form:

$$X = P\mathbf{1}_{\tau > T} + R\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq T}. \quad (1.1)$$

When constructing a model for the pricing of defaultable claims issued by a particular firm, say XYZ, one can proceed in two steps. First, one needs to model the value of the promised claim P , as well as the recovery claim R at intermediary times $0 \leq t \leq T$. For this, one can use the traditional default-free evaluation technique. For instance, the promised claim can be a fixed amount of dollars or commodity. The question of the recovery, even though more complicated, depends on the value of the contract's collateral (for instance a physical asset), which can be assumed to be default-free. In this case, default-free techniques may be applied. Another possibility is to estimate recovery rates from historical default data. Without regard of the technique chosen, we denote by $\mathbb{F}$ the information available to the modeler after the first step, i.e, the estimation of the promised and recovery assets, as well as the other available market information. We exclude information about the assets issued by the firm XYZ, even if it is available, since this should be the output of our evolution procedure, rather than the input. For instance, we consider that the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ does not contain information about the price of a defaultable bond issued by the firm XYZ, even though this bond might be traded. Usually, this construction leads to the situation where τ is not an $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time. For instance, in the classical Cox framework,

the default time is defined as:

$$\tau := \inf\{t | \Lambda_t > \Theta\},$$

where Λ is $\mathbb{F}$ predictable and increasing, and Θ is an exponential random variable independent from $\mathbb{F}$. This situation is also common in default models with incomplete information.

In a second step, we define the global filtration $\mathbb{G}$ (i.e., the one to use for pricing claims of the type (1.1)) in such a way that τ becomes a stopping time. We are thus in the progressive enlargements of filtrations setting.

When the random time is not a stopping time, several quantities play an important role in the analysis of the model. The most fundamental object attached to an arbitrary random time τ is certainly the supermartingale $Z_t^\tau = \mathbf{P}(\tau > t | \mathcal{F}_t)$, chosen to be càdlàg, called the Azéma's supermartingale associated with τ ([1]). In the credit risk literature, very often the random time τ is given with extra regularity assumptions, such as continuity or monotonicity of Z_t^τ . However, these assumptions were not translated into properties of the random time τ . We shall try to clarify the link between the assumptions about the process Z_t^τ and the properties of the default time τ , since it is crucial for the modeler to select the properties of the random time which appear to be the most sensible.

Two more processes, closely related to the Azéma supermartingale Z^τ and the $\mathbb{G}$ predictable compensator of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$, are often used in the evaluation of defaultable claims: the hazard process and the martingale hazard process, which we now define.

Definition 1.1. (1) Let τ be a random time such that $Z_t^\tau > 0$, for all $t \geq 0$ (in particular τ is not an $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time). The nonnegative stochastic process $(\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by:

$$\Gamma_t = -\ln Z_t^\tau,$$

is called the *hazard process*.

- (2) Let $D_t = \mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$. An $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable right-continuous increasing process Λ is called an *$\mathbb{F}$ -martingale hazard process* of the random time τ if the process $\widetilde{M}_t = D_t - \Lambda_{t \wedge \tau}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$ martingale.

We see that the martingale hazard process is only defined up to time τ and that the stopped martingale hazard process is the $\mathbb{G}$ -predictable compensator of the process D . This has two implications. First, several martingale hazard processes might exist for a default time, even if the predictable compensator is unique. Secondly, this representation allows the martingale hazard process to be $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted as stated in the definition even if, obviously, the compensator is only $\mathbb{G}$ -adapted. In the next section we will characterize the situation where the martingale hazard process is unique.

Another important problem is to know under which conditions the hazard process and the martingale hazard processes coincide: this was object of a conjecture made in [14]:

Conjecture: Suppose that the process Z_t^τ is decreasing. If Λ is continuous, then $\Lambda = \Gamma$.

We shall show that the problem was not well posed and we shall see how it should be phrased in order to have the equality between the hazard process and the martingale hazard process under some general conditions. More generally, the aim of this paper is to show that the general theory of stochastic processes provides a natural framework to pose and to study the modeling of default times, and that it helps solve in a simple way some of the problems raised there.

The paper is organized as follows:

In section 2, we recall some basic facts from the general theory of stochastic processes that will be relevant for this paper.

In section 3, we show that if Z_t^τ is continuous, then τ avoids stopping times. We also see under which conditions the martingale hazard process and the hazard process coincide: the pseudo-stopping times, introduced in [21], appear there as the most general class of random times for which these two processes are equal. Moreover, we prove that for honest times, which form another remarkable class of random times, the hazard process and the martingale hazard process always differ.

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank Monique Jeanblanc for very helpful conversations and comments that improved the first drafts of this paper.

2. BASIC FACTS

Throughout this paper, we assume we are given a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbf{P})$ satisfying the usual assumptions.

Definition 2.1. A random time τ is a nonnegative random variable $\tau : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$.

When dealing with arbitrary random times, one often works under the following conditions:

- Assumption **(C)**: all $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ -martingales are continuous (e.g: the Brownian filtration).
- Assumption **(A)**: the random time τ avoids every $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ -stopping time T , i.e. $\mathbf{P}[\rho = T] = 0$.

When we refer to assumptions **(CA)**, this will mean that both the conditions **(C)** and **(A)** hold.

We also recall the definition of the Azéma's supermartingale as well as some important processes related to it:

- the $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ supermartingale

$$Z_t^\tau = \mathbf{P}[\tau > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \tag{2.1}$$

chosen to be càdlàg, associated to τ by Azéma ([1]);

- the $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ dual optional and predictable projections of the process $1_{\{\tau \leq t\}}$, denoted respectively by A_t^τ and a_t^τ ;
- the càdlàg martingale

$$\mu_t^\tau = \mathbf{E}[A_\infty^\tau \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = A_t^\tau + Z_t^\tau.$$

We also consider the Doob-Meyer decomposition of (2.1):

$$Z_t^\tau = m_t^\tau - a_t^\tau.$$

We note that the supermartingale (Z_t^τ) is the optional projection of $\mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau[}$.

Let us also define very rigorously the progressively enlarged filtration $\mathbb{G}$.

We enlarge the initial filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ with the process $(\tau \wedge t)_{t \geq 0}$, so that the new enlarged filtration $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the smallest filtration (satisfying the usual assumptions) containing $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and making τ a stopping time, that is

$$\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{K}_{t+},$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \bigvee \sigma(\tau \wedge t).$$

A very common situation encountered in default times modeling is the (H) hypothesis framework: every $\mathbb{F}$ -local martingale is also a $\mathbb{G}$ -local martingale. For instance, this property is always satisfied when the default time is a Cox time.

However, it is possible to introduce more general random times. We recall the definition of pseudo-stopping times which extend the (H) hypothesis framework and which will play an important role in the study of hazard processes and martingale hazard processes.

Definition 2.2 ([21]). We say that τ is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ pseudo-stopping time if for every $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ -martingale (M_t) in $\mathcal{H}^1$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}M_\tau = \mathbf{E}M_0. \quad (2.2)$$

Remark. It is equivalent to assume that (2.2) holds for bounded martingales, since these are dense in $\mathcal{H}^1$. It can also be proved that then (2.2) also holds for all uniformly integrable martingales (see [21]).

The following characterization of pseudo-stopping times will be often used in the sequel:

Theorem 2.3 ([21]). *The following four properties are equivalent:*

- (1) τ is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ pseudo-stopping time, i.e (2.2) is satisfied;
- (2) $\mu_t^\tau \equiv 1$, a.s
- (3) $A_\infty^\tau \equiv 1$, a.s
- (4) every $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ local martingale (M_t) satisfies

$$(M_{t \wedge \tau})_{t \geq 0} \text{ is a local } (\mathcal{G}_t) \text{ martingale.}$$

If, furthermore, all $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ martingales are continuous, then each of the preceding properties is equivalent to

(5)

 $(Z_t^\tau)_{t \geq 0}$ is a decreasing $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ predictable process

Remark. Of course, every stopping time is a pseudo-stopping time by the optional sampling theorem. But there are many examples or families of pseudo-stopping which are not stopping times (see [21]). Similarly, all random times which ensure that the (H) hypothesis holds are pseudo-stopping times. But there are pseudo-stopping times for which the (H) hypothesis does not hold (in particular those which are $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ -measurable; see [21] for construction and further characterizations of pseudo-stopping times).

The following classical lemma will be very helpful: it indicates the properties of the above processes under the assumptions **(A)** or **(C)** (for more details or references, see [6] or [23]).

Lemma 2.4. *Under condition **(A)**, $A_t^\tau = a_t^\tau$ is continuous.*

*Under condition **(C)**, A^τ is predictable (recall that under **(C)** the predictable and optional sigma fields are equal) and consequently $A^\tau = a^\tau$.*

*Under conditions **(CA)**, Z^τ is continuous.*

We give a first application of theorem 2.3 and lemma 2.4 to illustrate how the general theory of stochastic processes shed a new light on default time modeling. It is very often assumed in the literature on default times that τ is a random time whose associated Azéma supermartingale is continuous and decreasing.

Proposition 2.5. *Let τ be a random time that avoids stopping times. Then (Z_t^τ) is continuous and decreasing if and only if τ is a pseudo-stopping time.*

Proof. If τ is a pseudo-stopping, then from theorem 2.3, $Z_t^\tau = 1 - A_t^\tau$. If τ avoids stopping times, then it follows from lemma 2.4 that A^τ is continuous and consequently Z^τ is continuous.

Conversely, if Z^τ is continuous, and if τ avoids stopping times, then from the uniqueness of the Doob-Meyer decomposition, $Z_t^\tau = 1 - a_t^\tau$. But since τ avoids stopping times, we have $a_t^\tau = A_t^\tau$ from lemma 2.4 and hence $Z_t^\tau = 1 - A_t^\tau$. Consequently, from theorem 2.3, τ is a pseudo-stopping time. $\square$

Remark. We shall see a slight reinforcement of this theorem in the next section: indeed, we shall prove that if Z^τ is continuous, then τ avoids stopping times.

3. MAIN THEOREMS

First, we clarify a situation concerning the hazard process. Indeed, in the credit risk literature, the $\mathbb{G}$ martingale $L_t \equiv \mathbf{1}_{\tau > t} e^{\Gamma_t}$ plays an important role (see [14] or [3]). But from definition 1.1, the hazard process is defined only when $Z_t^\tau > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. We wish to show that nevertheless, the martingale (L_t) is always well defined. For this, it is enough to show that on

the set $\{\tau > t\}$, $\Gamma_t = -\log Z_t^\tau$ is always well defined. This is the case thanks to the following result from the general theory of stochastic processes:

Proposition 3.1 ([15], [6], p.134). *Let τ be an arbitrary random time. The sets $\{Z^\tau = 0\}$ and $\{Z_-^\tau = 0\}$ are both disjoint from the stochastic interval $[0, \tau[$, and have the same lower bound T , which is the smallest stopping time larger than τ .*

The next proposition gives general conditions under which Γ is continuous, which is generally taken as an assumption in the literature on default times: indeed, when computing prices or hedging, one often has to integrate with respect to Γ (see [14], [9] or [3]).

Proposition 3.2. *Let τ be a random time.*

- (i) *Then under $(\mathbf{CA})$, (Γ_t) is continuous and $\Gamma_0 = 0$.*
- (ii) *If τ is a pseudo-stopping time and if $(\mathbf{A})$ holds, then (Γ_t) is a continuous increasing process, with $\Gamma_0 = 0$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 2.4 and theorem 2.3. $\square$

Now, what can one say about the random time τ if one assumes that its associated Azéma's supermartingale is continuous? It seems to have been an open question in the literature on credit risk modeling for a few years now. The next proposition answers this question:

Proposition 3.3. *Let τ be a finite random time such that its associated Azéma's supermartingale Z_t^τ is continuous. Then τ avoids stopping times.*

Proof. It is known that

$$Z_t^\tau = {}^o(\mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau)}),$$

that is Z_t^τ is the optional projection of the stochastic interval $[0, \tau)$. Now, following Jeulin-Yor [17], define $\tilde{Z}_t$ as the optional projection of the stochastic interval $[0, \tau]$:

$$\tilde{Z}_t = {}^o(\mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau]}).$$

It can be shown (see [17]) that

$$\tilde{Z}_+ = Z^\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Z}_- = Z_-^\tau.$$

Since Z^τ is continuous, we have

$$\tilde{Z}_+ = \tilde{Z}_- = Z^\tau,$$

and consequently, for any stopping time T :

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq T}] - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\tau > T}] = 0,$$

which means that $\mathbf{P}[\tau = T] = 0$ for all stopping times T . $\square$

As an application, we can state the following enforcement of proposition 2.5:

Corollary 3.4. *Let τ be a random time. Then (Z_t^τ) is a continuous and decreasing process if and only if τ is a pseudo-stopping time that avoids stopping times.*

Now we recall a theorem which is useful in constructing the martingale hazard process.

Theorem 3.5 ([16]). *Let H be a bounded $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ predictable process. Then*

$$H_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t} - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{H_s}{Z_{s-}^\tau} da_s^\tau$$

is a $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ martingale.

Corollary 3.6. *Let τ be a pseudo-stopping time that avoids $\mathbb{F}$ stopping times. Then the $\mathbb{G}$ dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$ is $\log \left(\frac{1}{Z_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau} \right)$.*

Let g be an honest time (that means that g is the end of an $\mathbb{F}$ optional set) that avoids $\mathbb{F}$ stopping times. Then the $\mathbb{G}$ dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{g \leq t}$ is A_t^g .

Proof. Let τ be a random time; taking $H \equiv 1$, in Theorem 3.5 we find that $\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{1}{Z_{s-}^\tau} dA_s^\tau$ is the $\mathbb{G}$ dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$.

When τ is a pseudo-stopping time that avoids $\mathbb{F}$ stopping times, we have from Theorem 2.3 that the $\mathbb{G}$ dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$ is $-\log(Z_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau)$ since in this case $A_t^\tau = 1 - Z_t^\tau$ is continuous.

The second fact is an easy consequence of the well known fact that the measure dA_t^g is carried by $\{t : Z_t^g = 1\}$ (see [1]). $\square$

As a consequence, we have the following characterization of the martingale hazard process:

Proposition 3.7. *Let τ be a random time. Suppose that $Z_t^\tau > 0, \forall t$. Then, there exists a unique martingale hazard process Λ_t , given by:*

$$\Lambda_t = \int_0^t \frac{da_u^\tau}{Z_{u-}^\tau},$$

where recall that a_t^τ is the dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$.

Proof. We suppose there exist two different martingale hazard processes Λ^1 and Λ^2 and denote

$$T(\omega) = \inf \{t : \Lambda_t^1(\omega) \neq \Lambda_t^2(\omega)\}.$$

T is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ -stopping time hence a $\mathbb{G}$ stopping time. Due to the uniqueness of the predictable compensator we must have for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\Lambda_{t \wedge \tau}^1 = \Lambda_{t \wedge \tau}^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Hence, $T > \tau$ a.s. and hence $Z_t^\tau = 0, \forall t \geq T$. By assumption, this is impossible, hence $\Lambda^1 = \Lambda^2$ a.s. $\square$

It is conjectured in [14] that if τ is any random time (possibly a stopping time) such that $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq t | \mathcal{F}_t)$ is an increasing process, and if the martingale hazard process Λ is continuous, then $\Lambda = \Gamma$, where Γ is the hazard process. We now provide a counterexample to this conjecture. Indeed, let τ be a totally inaccessible stopping time of the filtration $\mathbb{F}$. Then of course $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq t | \mathcal{F}_t) = \mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$ is an increasing process. Let now (A_t) be the predictable compensator of $\mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t}$. It is well known (see [1] or [15] for example) that A_t is a continuous process (that satisfies $A_t = A_{t \wedge \tau}$) and hence $\Lambda_t = A_t$ is continuous. But clearly $\Gamma_t \neq \Lambda_t$.

We propose the following theorem instead of the above conjecture (recall that the fact that Azéma's supermartingale is continuous and decreasing means that τ is a pseudo-stopping time):

Theorem 3.8. *Let τ be a pseudo-stopping time. Assume further that $Z_t^\tau > 0$ for all t .*

- (i) *Under (A), Γ is continuous and $\Gamma_t = \Lambda_t = -\ln Z_t$.*
- (ii) *Under (C), if Λ is continuous, then $\Gamma_t = \Lambda_t = -\ln Z_t$.*

Proof. (i) follows from lemma 2.4, Theorem 2.3 and proposition 3.7.

(ii) Assume (C) holds. Since Λ is assumed to be continuous, it follows from proposition 3.7 (2) that a_t^τ is continuous. Hence τ avoids all predictable stopping times. But under (C), all stopping times are predictable. Consequently τ avoids all stopping times and we apply part (i). $\square$

It has been proved in [14] that in general, even under the assumptions (CA), the hazard process and the martingale hazard process may differ. The example they used was $g \equiv \sup\{t \leq 1 : W_t = 0\}$, where W denotes as usual the standard Brownian Motion. This time is a typical example of an honest time (i.e. the end of an optional set). We shall now show that this result actually holds for any honest time g and compute explicitly the difference in this case. We shall need for this the following characterisation of honest times given in [22]:

Theorem 3.9 ([22]). *Let g be an honest time. Then, under the conditions (CA), there exists a unique continuous and nonnegative local martingale $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$, with $N_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} N_t = 0$, such that:*

$$Z_t^g = \mathbf{P}(g > t | \mathcal{F}_t) = \frac{N_t}{\Sigma_t},$$

where $\Sigma_t = \sup_{s \leq t} N_s$. The honest time g is also given by:

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \sup\{t \geq 0 : N_t = \Sigma_\infty\} \\ &= \sup\{t \geq 0 : \Sigma_t - N_t = 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 3.10. *Let g be an honest time. Under (CA), assume that $\mathbf{P}(g > t | \mathcal{F}_t) > 0$. Then there exists a unique strictly positive and continuous local martingale N , with $N_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} N_t = 0$, such that:*

$$\Gamma_t = \ln \Sigma_t - \ln N_t \text{ whilst } \Lambda_t = \ln \Sigma_t,$$

where $\Sigma_t = \sup_{s \leq t} N_s$. Consequently,

$$\Lambda_t - \Gamma_t = \ln N_t,$$

and $\Gamma \neq \Lambda$.

Proof. From theorem 3.9, there exists a unique strictly positive continuous local martingale N , such that $N_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} N_t = 0$, such that:

$$Z_t^g = \mathbf{P}(g > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = \frac{N_t}{\Sigma_t}.$$

Now an application of Itô's formula yields:

$$\mathbf{P}(g > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = 1 + \int_0^t \frac{dN_s}{\Sigma_s} - \int_0^t \frac{N_s}{\Sigma_s^2} d\Sigma_s.$$

But on the support of $(d\Sigma_s)$, we have $\Sigma_t = N_t$ and hence:

$$\mathbf{P}(g > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = 1 + \int_0^t \frac{dN_s}{\Sigma_s} - \ln \Sigma_t.$$

From the uniqueness of the Doob-Meyer decomposition, we deduce that the dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{g \leq t}$ is $\ln \Sigma_t$. Now, applying proposition 3.7, we have:

$$\Lambda_t = \int_0^t \frac{d(\ln \Sigma_s)}{\mathbf{P}(g > s \mid \mathcal{F}_s)} = \int_0^t \frac{\Sigma_s}{\Sigma_s N_s} d\Sigma_s = \ln \Sigma_t,$$

where we have again used the fact that the support of $(d\Sigma_s)$, we have $\Sigma_t = N_t$. The result of the proposition now follows easily. $\square$

We shall now outline a nontrivial consequence of Theorem 3.9 here. In [2], the authors are interested in giving explicit examples of dual predictable projections of processes of the form $\mathbf{1}_{L \leq t}$, where L is an honest time. Indeed, these dual projections are natural examples of increasing injective processes (see [2] for more details and references). With Theorem 3.9, we have a complete characterization of such projections, which are also very important in credit risk modeling:

Corollary 3.11. *Assume the assumption (C) holds, and let (C_t) be an increasing process. Then C is the dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{g \leq t}$, for some honest time g that avoids stopping times, if and only if there exists a continuous local martingale N_t , with $N_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} N_t = 0$, such that*

$$C_t = \ln \Sigma_t.$$

Proof. This is a consequence of theorem 3.9 and the fact, established in the proof of proposition 3.10, that the dual predictable projection of $\mathbf{1}_{g \leq t}$ is $\ln \Sigma_t$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. AZÉMA: *Quelques applications de la théorie générale des processus I*, Invent. Math. **18** (1972) 293–336.
- [2] J. AZÉMA, T. JEULIN, F. KNIGHT, M. YOR: *Quelques calculs de compensateurs impliquant l'injectivité de certains processus croissants*, Sémin. Probab. XXXII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1686**, (1998), 316–327.
- [3] C. BLANCHET-SCAILLET, M. JEANBLANC: *Hazard rate for credit risk and hedging defaultable contingent claims*, Finance Stochast., **8**, 145–159 (2004).
- [4] D. COCULESCU, H. GEMAN AND M. JEANBLANC: *Valuation of default-sensitive claims under imperfect information*, Finance Stochast., **12**(2), 195–218 (2008).
- [5] D. COCULESCU, M. JEANBLANC AND A. NIKEGHBALI: *No arbitrage conditions in default models*, in preparation.
- [6] C. DELLACHERIE, B. MAISONNEUVE, P.A. MEYER: *Probabilités et potentiel*, Chapitres XVII-XXIV: Processus de Markov (fin), Compléments de calcul stochastique, Hermann (1992).
- [7] DUFFIE, D. AND D. LANDO (2001): Term Structures of Credit Spreads with Incomplete Accounting Information, *Econometrica*, **69**(3), 633–664.
- [8] DUFFIE, D. AND K. SINGLETON (1999): Modelling Term Structures of Defaultable Bonds, *The Review of Financial Studies*, **12**(4), 687–720.
- [9] R.J. ELLIOTT, M. JEANBLANC, M. YOR: *On models of default risk*, Math. Finance, **10**, 179–196 (2000).
- [10] R. FREY AND T. SCHMIDT: "Pricing Corporate Securities under Noisy Asset Information", 2007. Forthcoming in Mathematical Finance.
- [11] GUO, X., R.A. JARROW AND Y. ZENG (2005): Credit risk models with incomplete information, Mathematics of Operations Research, To appear..
- [12] JARROW, R.A. LANDO, D. AND S.M. TURNBULL (1997): A Markov model for the term structure of credit risk spreads, *Review of Financial Studies*, **10**(2), 481–523.
- [13] JARROW, R.A. AND S.M. TURNBULL (1995): Pricing Options on Derivative Securities Subject to Credit Risk, *Journal of Finance*, **50**(1), 53–85.
- [14] M. JEANBLANC, M. RUTKOWSKI: *Modeling default risk: Mathematical tools*, Fixed Income and Credit risk modeling and Management, New York University, Stern School of business, Statistics and Operations Research Department, Workshop (2000).
- [15] T. JEULIN: *Semi-martingales et grossissements d'une filtration*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **833**, Springer (1980).
- [16] T. JEULIN, M. YOR: *Grossissement d'une filtration et semimartingales: formules explicites*, Sémin. Probab. XII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **649**, (1978), 78–97.
- [17] T. JEULIN, M. YOR (EDS): *Grossissements de filtrations: exemples et applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1118**, Springer (1985).
- [18] KUSUOKA, S. (1999): A Remark on Default Risk Models, *Advances on Mathematical Economics*, **1**, 69–82.
- [19] LANDO, D. (1998): On Cox Processes and Credit Risky Securities, *Review of Derivatives Research*, **2**(2/3), 99–120.
- [20] MADAN, D. AND H. UNAL (1998): Pricing the risks of default, *Review of Derivatives Research*, **2**(2/3), 121–160.
- [21] A. NIKEGHBALI, M. YOR: *A definition and some characteristic properties of pseudo-stopping times*, Ann. Probab. **33**, (2005) 1804–1824.
- [22] A. NIKEGHBALI, M. YOR: *Doob's maximal identity, multiplicative decompositions and enlargements of filtrations*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics, **50** (4) 791–814 (2006).
- [23] A. NIKEGHBALI: *An essay on the general theory of stochastic processes*, Prob. Surveys, **3**, (2006) 345–412.

ETHZ, DEPARTEMENT MATHEMATIK, RÄMISTRASSE 101, ZÜRICH 8092, SWITZERLAND.

E-mail address: `delia.coculescu@math.ethz.ch`

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT ZÜRICH, WINTERTHURERSTRASSE 190, CH-8057 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: `ashkan.nikeghbali@math.uzh.ch`